arXiv:1609.00955v1 [math.AC] 4 Sep 2016

THE LARGE SUM GRAPH RELATED TO COMULTIPLICATION MODULES

H. ANSARI-TOROGHY[1] AND F. MAHBOOBI-ABKENAR[2]

Abstract. Let R be a commutative ring and M be an R-module. We define the large sum graph, denoted by $\acute{G}(M)$, as a graph with the vertex set of non-large submodules of M and two distinct vertices are adjacent if and only if $N+K$ is a non-large submodule of M. In this article, we investigate the connection between the graph-theoretic properties of $\acute{G}(M)$ and some algebraic properties of M when M is a comultiplication R-module.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R will denote a commutative ring with identity and $\mathbb{Z}$ will denote the ring of integers.

Let M be an R-module. We denote the set of all minimal submodules of M by $Min(M)$ and the sum of all minimal submodules of M by $Soc(M)$. A submodule N of M is called *large* in M and denoted by $N \trianglelefteq M$) in case for every submodule L of M, $N \cap L \neq 0$. A module M is called a *uniform* module if the intersection of any two non-zero submodules of M is non-zero.

A *graph* G is defined as the pair $(V(G), E(G))$, where $V(G)$ is the set of vertices of G and $E(G)$ is the set of edges of G. For two distinct vertices a and b denoted by $a - b$ means that a and b are adjacent. The *degree* of a vertex a of graph G which denoted by $deg(a)$ is the number of edges incident on a. A regular graph is *r-regular* (or regular of degree r) if the degree of each vertex is r. If $|V(G)| \geqslant 2$, a *path* from a to b is a series of adjacent vertices $a - v_1 - v_2 - ... - v_n - b$. In a graph G, the distance between two distinct vertices a and b, denoted

Key words and phrases. Graph, Non-large submodule, Comultiplication module.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 05C75. Secondary: 13A99, 05C99.

by $d(a,b)$ is the length of the shortest path connecting a and b. If there is not a path between a and b, $d(a,b)=\infty$. The *diameter* of a graph G is $diam(G)=sup\{d(a,b)\,|\,a,b\in V(G)\}$. A graph G is called *connected* if for any vertices a and b of G there is a path between a and b. If not, G is *disconnected*. The *girth* of G, denoted by $g(G)$, is the length of the shortest cycle in G. If G has no cycle, we define the girth of G to be infinite. An *r-partite* graph is one whose vertex set can be partitioned into r subsets such that no edge has both ends in any one subset. A *complete* r-partite graph is one each vertex is jointed to every vertex that is not in the same subset. The *complete bipartite* (i.e, 2-partite) graph with part sizes m and n is denoted by $K_{m,n}$. A *star* graph is a completed bipartite graph with part sizes $m=1$ or $n=1$. A *clique* of a graph is its maximal complete subgraph and the number of vertices in the largest clique of a graph G, denoted by $\omega(G)$, is called the *clique number* of G. For a graph $G=(V,E)$, a set $S\subseteq V$ is an *independent* if no two vertices in S are adjacent. The *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ is the maximum size of an independent set in G. The (open) *neighbourhood* $N(a)$ of a vertex $a\in V$ is the set of vertices which are adjacent to a. For each $S\subseteq V$, $N(S)=\bigcup_{a\in S}N(a)$ and $N[S]=N(S)\bigcup S$. A set of vertices S in G is a *dominating set*, if $N[S]=V$. The *dominating number*, $\gamma(G)$, of G is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G ([6]). Note that a graph whose vertices-set is empty is a *null graph* and a graph whose edge-set is empty is an *empty* graph.

A module M is said to be a *comultiplication* R-module if for every submodule N of M there exists an ideal I of R such that $N=Ann_M(I)$. Also an R-module M is comultiplication module if and only if for each submodule N of M, we have $N=(0:_M Ann_R(N))$ ([2]).

In this article, we introduce and study *the sum large graph* $\acute{G}(M)$ of M, where M is a comultiplication module. In section 2, we give the definition of $\acute{G}(M)$ and consider some basic results on the structure of this graph. In Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, we provide some useful characterization about $\acute{G}(M)$. In Theorem 2.9, it is shown that if $\acute{G}(M)$ is connected, then $diam(\acute{G}(M))\leqslant 2$. Also we prove that if $\acute{G}(M)$ contains a cycle, then $g(\acute{G}(M))=3$ (Theorem 2.10). Moreover, it is proved that if $\acute{G}(M)$ is a connected graph, then $\acute{G}(M)$ has no cut vertex (Theorem 2.11). Finally, in section 3, we investigate the clique number, dominating number, and independence number of this graph.

2. Basic properties of $\acute{G}(M)$

Definition 2.1. Let M be an R-module. We define the *large sum graph* $\acute{G}(M)$ *of* M with all non-large non-zero submodules of M as vertices and two distinct vertices N, K are adjacent if and only if $N + K$ is a non-large submodule of M.

A non-zero submodule S of M is said to be *second* if for each $a \in R$, the endomorphism of M given by multiplication by a is either surjective or zero. This implies that $Ann_R(N)$ is a prime ideal of R ([7]).

The next lemma plays a key role in the sequel.

Lemma 2.2. *Let M be a non-zero comultiplication R-module.*

(a) *Every non-zero submodule of M contains a minimal submodule of M. In particular, $Min(M) \neq \varnothing$.*
(b) *Let N be a submodule of M. Then N is a large submodule of M if and only if $Soc(M) \subseteq N$.*
(c) *Let N, K be submodules of M and let S be a second submodule of M with $S \supseteq N + K$. Then $S \supseteq N$ or $S \supseteq K$.*

Proof. (a) See [3, Theorem 3.2].

(b) Let N be a large submodule of M. Assume to the contrary that $Soc(M) \nsubseteq N$. Then for each $S_j \in Min(M)$, we have $S_j \nsubseteq N$. Since N is a large submodule of M, $N \cap S_j \neq 0$. Since S_j is a minimal submodule of M and $N \cap S_j \subseteq S_j$, we have $S_j \cap N = S_j$, which is a contradiction. Conversely, suppose to the contrary that N is not a large submodule of M. Then there exists a submodule K of M such that $N \cap K = 0$. By part (a), there exists a minimal submodule L of M such that $L \subseteq K$. So we have $L \cap N \subseteq K \cap N = 0$, which implies that $L \nsubseteq N$, a contradiction. Thus N is a large submodule of M.

(c) See [4, Theorem 2.6]. □

In the rest of this paper, we assume that M is a non-zero comultiplication R-module. We recall that $Min(M) \neq \varnothing$ by Lemma 2.2 part (a).

Lemma 2.3. *Let M be an R-module with $Min(M) = \{S_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $|I| > 1$, and let Λ be a non-empty proper finite subset of I. Then $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} S_\lambda$ is non-large submodule of M.*

Proof. Let $\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} S_\lambda$ be a large submodule of M and let $j \in I\setminus\Lambda$. Then by Lemma 2.2 (b), $S_j \subseteq \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} S_\lambda$. Since S_j is a second submodule of M, by Lemma 2.2 (c), $S_j \subseteq S_\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$, a contradiction. □

We recall that an R-module M is said to be *finitely cogenerated* if for every set $\{M_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ of submodules of M, $\cap_{\lambda\in\Lambda} M_\lambda = 0$ implies $\cap_{i=1}^{n} M_{\lambda_i} = 0$ for some positive integer n ([1]). Moreover, an R-module M is said to be *cocyclic* if Soc(M) is a large and a simple submodule of M ([7]).

Proposition 2.4. *Let M be an R-module. Then $\acute{G}(M)$ is a null graph if and only if M is a cocyclic module.*

Proof. This is straightforward. □

Note that all definitions graph theory are for non-null graphs [5]. So in the rest of this paper we assume that $\acute{G}(M)$ is a non-null graph.

Lemma 2.5. *Let M be an R-module. Then M is uniform if and only if M is a cocyclic R-module.*

Proof. This is obvious. □

Theorem 2.6. *Let M be an R-module. Then $\acute{G}(M)$ is an empty graph if and only if $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$ such that $\frac{M}{S_1}$ and $\frac{M}{S_2}$ are finitely cogenerated uniform R-modules.*

Proof. Let $\acute{G}(M)$ be an empty graph. If $|Min(M)| > 2$, then by Lemma 2.3, $S_1, S_2 \in Min(M)$ are adjacent, a contradiction. Thus $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$. Now we claim that $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$ is a minimal submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$ because $\frac{S_2}{S_1\cap S_2} \simeq \frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$, where $S_1 \cap S_2 = 0$. We show that $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$ is the only minimal submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$. Suppose that $\frac{K}{S_1}$ is a minimal submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$. If $\frac{K}{S_1}$ is a large submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$, then $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1} = \frac{Soc(M)}{S_1} \subseteq \frac{K}{S_1}$ which implies that $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1} = \frac{K}{S_1}$, a contradiction. Now assume that $\frac{K}{S_1}$ is a non-large submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$. Then K is a non-large submodule of M. So we have $K + S_1 = K \not\supseteq M$ (i.e., K is a non-large submodule of M) which follows that K and S_1 are adjacent, a contradiction. Thus $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$ is the only minimal submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$, and therefore $\frac{M}{S_1}$ is a uniform module. Since $Soc(\frac{M}{S_1}) = \frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$ is a simple module, $\frac{M}{S_1}$ is a finitely cogenerated module by [1, Proposition 10.7]. Conversely, let $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$. Then clearly, S_1 and S_2 are not adjacent. We

claim that there is no vertex $N \neq S_1, S_2$. Assume to the contrary that N is a vertex of $\acute{G}(M)$. By Lemma 2.2 (a), $S_1 \subseteq N$ or $S_2 \subseteq N$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $S_1 \subseteq N$. One can see that $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1}$ is a minimal submodule of $\frac{M}{S_1}$. Since $\frac{M}{S_1}$ is a cocyclic module by lemma 2.5, for any submodule $\frac{N}{S_1}$, we have $\frac{S_1+S_2}{S_1} = Soc(\frac{M}{S_1}) \subseteq \frac{N}{S_1}$. Thus each submodule N of M is a large submodule by Lemma 2.2 (b), a contradiction. Hence $\acute{G}(M)$ is an empty graph. □

Theorem 2.7. *Let M be an R-module. The following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *$\acute{G}(M)$ is not connected.*
(ii) *$|Min(M)| = 2$*
(iii) *$\acute{G}(M) = \acute{G}_1 \cup \acute{G}_2$, where $\acute{G}_1$ and $\acute{G}_2$ are complete and disjoint subgraphs.*

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ Assume to the contrary that $|Min(M)| > 2$. Since $\acute{G}(M)$ is not connected, we can consider two components $\acute{G}_1, \acute{G}_2$ and N, K two submodules of M such that $N \in \acute{G}_1$ and $K \in \acute{G}_2$. Choose $S_1, S_2 \in Min(M)$ such that $S_1 \subseteq N$ and $S_2 \subseteq K$. If $S_1 = S_2$, then $N - S_1 - K$ is a path, a contradiction. So we can assume that $S_1 \neq S_2$. Since $Min(M) > 2$, $S_1 + S_2$ is a non-large submodule of M by Lemma 2.3. Thus $N - S_1 - S_2 - K$ is a path between $\acute{G}_1$ and $\acute{G}_2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $|Min(M)| = 2$.
$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$ Let $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$. Set $\acute{G}_j := \{N \leq M \mid N \subseteq S_j \, and \, N \not\trianglelefteq M\}$, where $j = 1, 2$. Assume that $N, K \in \acute{G}_1$. We claim that N and K are adjacent. Otherwise, If $N + K \trianglelefteq M$, then $S_1 + S_2 = Soc(M) \subseteq N + K$ by Lemma 2.2 (b). Now by using Lemma 2.2 (c), $S_1 + S_2 \subseteq N$ or $S_1 + S_2 \subseteq K$. So N or K are large submodules of M, a contradiction. By using similar arguments for $\acute{G}_2$, we can conclude that $\acute{G}_1, \acute{G}_2$ are complete subgraphs of $\acute{G}(M)$. We claim that these two subgraphs are disjoint. Assume to the contrary that $N_1 \in \acute{G}_1$ and $N_2 \in \acute{G}_2$ are adjacent. Then $Soc(M) = S_1 + S_2 \subseteq N_1 + N_2$ which implies that $N_1 + N_2$ is a large submodule of M by Lemma 2.2 (b), a contradiction.
$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$ This is obvious. □

Remark 2.8. The condition that "M is a comultiplication module" can not be omitted in Theorem 2.7. For example, let $M = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-module and let $N_1 := (0,1)\mathbb{Z}$, $N_2 := (0,2)\mathbb{Z}$, $N_3 := (1,0)\mathbb{Z}$, $N_4 := (1,1)\mathbb{Z}$, *and* $N_5 := (1,2)\mathbb{Z}$. Then $V(\acute{G}(M)) = \{N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4, N_5\}$

and $Min(M) = \{N_2, N_3, N_5\}$. Thus $|Min(M)| > 2$ but $\acute{G}(M)$ is not a connected graph.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\acute{G}(M)$ be a connected graph. Then $diam(\acute{G}(M)) \leqslant 2$.*

Proof. Let N and K be two vertices of $\acute{G}(M)$ such that they are not adjacent. By Lemma 2.2 (a), there exist two minimal submodules S_1, S_2 of M such that $S_1 \subseteq N$ and $S_2 \subseteq K$. If $N+S_2 \nsubseteq M$, then $N-S_2-K$ is a path. So $d(N, K) = 2$. Similarly, if $K + S_1 \nsubseteq M$, then $d(N, K) = 2$. Now assume that $N + S_2 \trianglelefteq M$ and $K + S_1 \trianglelefteq M$. By Theorem 2.7, $|Min(M)| \geq 3$ because $\acute{G}(M)$ is a connected graph. Let S_3 be a minimal submodule of M such that $S_3 \neq S_1, S_2$. Thus by Lemma 2.2 (b), we have $S_3 \subseteq Soc(M) \subseteq N + S_3$ and $S_3 \subseteq Soc(M) \subseteq K + S_1$. Now Lemma 2.2 (c) shows that $S_3 \subseteq N$ and $S_3 \subseteq K$. Hence we have $N - S_3 - K$. Therefore, $d(N, K) = 2$. □

Theorem 2.10. *Let M be an R-module and $\acute{G}(M)$ contains a cycle. Then $g(\acute{G}(M)) = 3$.*

Proof. If $|Min(M)| = 2$, then $\acute{G}(M) = \acute{G}_1 \cup \acute{G}_2$, where $\acute{G}_1$ and $\acute{G}_2$ are complete disjoint subgraphs by Theorem 2.7. Since $\acute{G}(M)$ contains a cycle and $\acute{G}_1, \acute{G}_2$ are disjoint complete subgraphs, $g(\acute{G}(M)) = 3$. Now assume that $|Min(M)| \geq 3$ and choose $S_1, S_2, and\, S_3 \in Min(M)$. By Lemma 2.3, $S_1 - S_2 - S_3 - S_1$ is a cycle. Hence $g(\acute{G}(M)) = 3$. □

A vertex a in a connected graph G is a *cut vertex* if $G - \{a\}$ is disconnected.

Theorem 2.11. *Let M be an R-module. If $\acute{G}(M)$ is a connected graph, then $\acute{G}(M)$ has no cut vertex.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that there exists a vertex $N \in V(\acute{G}(M))$ such that $\acute{G}(M) \setminus N$ is not connected. Thus there exist at leat two vertices K, L such that N lies in every path between them. By Theorem 2.9, the shortest path between K and L is length of two. So we have $K - N - L$. Firstly, we claim that N is a minimal submodule of M. Otherwise, there exists a minimal submodule S of M such that $S \subset N$ by Lemma 2.2 (a). Since $S + K \subseteq N + K$ and $N + K \nsubseteq M$, we have $S + K \nsubseteq M$. By similar arguments, $S + L$ is a non-large submodule of M. Hence $K - S - L$ is a path in $\acute{G}(M) \setminus N$, a contradiction. Thus N is a minimal submodule of M. Now we claim that there is a minimal submodule $S_i \neq N$ such that $S_i \nsubseteq K$. Suppose on the contrary that $S_i \subseteq K$ for each $S_i \in Min(M)$. So we have $Soc(M) \subseteq K + N$. This

implies that $K + N$ is a large submodule of M by Lemma 2.2 (b), a contradiction. Similarly, there exits a minimal submodule $S_j \neq N$ of M such that $S_j \nsubseteq L$. Note that for each $S_t \in Min(M)$, we have $S_t \subseteq K + L$ because $K + L$ is a large submodule of M. So $S_t \subseteq K$ or $S_t \subseteq L$ by Lemma 2.2 (c). Now let $N \neq S_i, S_j \in Min(M)$ such that $S_i \nsubseteq K$ and $S_j \nsubseteq L$ (Note that $S_i \neq S_j$). Hence we have $S_i \subseteq L$ and $S_j \subseteq K$. This implies that $K - S_i - S_j - L$ is a path in $\acute{G}(M) \setminus L$, a contradiction. □

Theorem 2.12. *Let M be an R-module. Then $\acute{G}(M)$ can not be a complete n-partite graph.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $\acute{G}(M)$ is a complete n-partite graph with parts $U_1, U_2, ..., U_n$. By Lemma 2.3, for every $S_i, S_j \in Min(M)$, S_i and S_j are adjacent. Hence each U_i contains at most one minimal submodule. By Pigeon hole principal, $|Min(M)| \leqslant n$. Now we claim that $|Min(M)| = t$ where $t < n$. Let $S_i \in V_i$, for each i $(1 \leq i \leq t)$. Then V_{t+1} contains no minimal submodule of M. By Lemma 2.3, $\Sigma_{j\neq i}S_j$ is a non-large submodule of M. Clearly, $\Sigma_{j\neq i}S_j$ and S_i are not adjacent because $Soc(M) = \Sigma_{j\neq i}S_j + S_i$. Hence $\Sigma_{j\neq i}S_j \in V_i$. Let N be a vertex in V_{t+1}. Then by Lemma 2.2 (a), there exists $S_k \in Min(M)$ such that $S_k \subseteq N$. So N and S_k are adjacent, where $S_k \in V_k$. Since $\acute{G}(M)$ is a complete n-partite graph, N adjacent to all vertices in V_k. So N and $\Sigma_{j\neq k}S_j$ are adjacent. However, $Soc(M) = S_k + \Sigma_{j\neq k}S_j$ which implies that $N + \Sigma_{j\neq k}S_j \trianglelefteq M$ by Lemma 2.3, a contradiction. Hence $|Min(M)| = t$. Now set $K := \Sigma_{i=3}S_i$. By Lemma 2.3, K is a non-large submodule of M. Since $K + S_1 = \Sigma_{i\neq 2}S_i \nsubseteq M$, K and S_1 are adjacent. Similarly, K is adjacent to S_2. Thus $K \notin V_1, V_2$. Furthermore, $K + S_i = K \nsubseteq M$ for each i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$. Hence K is adjacent to all minimal submodules S_i of M. So for each i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$, $K \notin V_i$, a contradiction. □

Proposition 2.13. *Let M be an R-module with $|Min(M)| < \infty$. Then we have the following.*

(i) *There is no vertex in $\acute{G}(M)$ which is adjacent to every other vertex.*
(ii) *$\acute{G}(M)$ can not be a complete graph.*

Proof. (i) Assume on the contrary that there exists a submodule $N \in V(\acute{G}(M))$ such that N is adjacent to all vertices of $\acute{G}(M)$. By Lemma 2.2 (a), there is a minimal submodule $S_i \in Min(M)$ such that $S_i \subseteq N$. Now set $K := \Sigma_{j\neq i}S_j$. Clearly, $K \nsubseteq M$ by Lemma 2.3. Since N is adjacent to all other vertices of $\acute{G}(M)$, $N+K$ is a non-large submodule

of M. However, $Soc(M) = \Sigma_{j\neq i} S_j + S_i \subseteq N + K$ which shows that $N + K \trianglelefteq M$ by Lemma 2.2 (b), a contradiction.

(ii) This follows from (i).

□

A vertex of a graph G is said to be *pendent* if its neighbourhood contains exactly one vertex.

Theorem 2.14. *Let M be an R-module. Then we have the following.*

(i) *$\acute{G}(M)$ contains a pendent vertex if and only if $|Min(M)| = 2$ and $\acute{G}(M) = \acute{G}_1 \cup \acute{G}_2$, where $\acute{G}_1, \acute{G}_2$ are two disjoint complete subgraphs and $|V(\acute{G}_i)| = 2$ for some $i = 1, 2$.*

(ii) *$\acute{G}(M)$ is not a star graph.*

Proof. (i) Let N be a pendent vertex of $\acute{G}(M)$. Assume on the contrary that $|Min(M)| \geq 3$. Clearly, for each $S_i \in Min(M)$, S_i is adjacent to every other minimal submodules of M. So $deg(S_i) \geq 2$. Thus N is not a minimal submodule of M. By Lemma 2.2 (a), there exists a minimal submodule of S_1 of M such that $S_1 \subseteq N$. Note that the only vertex which is adjacent to N is S_1 because $deg(N) = 1$. Hence there is no minimal submodule $S_i \neq S_1$ such that $S_i \subseteq N$. Moreover, $N + S_2$ is a large submodule of M. So by Lemma 2.2 (b), $S_j \subseteq Soc(M) \subseteq N + S_2$, for each $S_j \neq S_1, S_2$. This implies that $S_j \subseteq N$ by Lemma 2.2 (c), a contradiction. Hence $|Min(M)| = 2$. By Theorem 2.7, $\acute{G}(M) = \acute{G}_1 \cup \acute{G}_2$, where $\acute{G}_1$ and $\acute{G}_2$ are disjoint complete subgraphs. This is easy to see that $|V(\acute{G}_i)| = 2$. The converse is straightforward.

(ii) Suppose that $\acute{G}(M)$ is a star graph. Then $\acute{G}(M)$ has a pendent vertex. So by part (i), we have $|Min(M)| = 2$. Thus $\acute{G}(M)$ is not a connected graph by Theorem 2.7, a contradiction.

□

Theorem 2.15. *Let M be an R-module.*

(i) *Let N, K be two vertex of $\acute{G}(M)$ such that $N \subseteq K$. Then $deg(N) \leq deg(K)$.*

(ii) *Let $\acute{G}(M)$ be a r-regular graph. Then $|Min(M)| = 2$ and $|V(\acute{G}(M))| = 2r + 2$.*

Proof. (i) Let $N, K \in V(\acute{G}(M))$ such that $N \subseteq K$. Let L be a vertex of $\acute{G}(M)$ such that L is adjacent to N. Thus $N + L$ is a non-large submodule of M and so that $K + L$ is a non-large submodule of M. So L is adjacent to K. Therefore, $deg(N) \leq deg(K)$.

(ii) Suppose on the contrary that $|Min(M)| \geq 3$. By using Lemma 2.3 and our assumption, $Min(M)$ is a finite set. Next for $S_1, S_2 \in Min(M)$, we have $deg(S_1) \leq deg(S_1 + S_2)$ by part (a). We claim that $deg(S_1 + S_2) \neq deg(S_1)$. Otherwise, if $N := \Sigma_{j \neq 2} S_j$, then N is adjacent to S_1. However, N is not adjacent to $S_1 + S_2$, a contradiction. So $r < deg(S_1 + S_2)$, which is a contradiction. Thus $|Min(M)| \leq 2$. If $|Min(M)| = 1$, then $\acute{G}(M)$ is null graph, a contradiction. Thus $|Min(M)| = 2$ and so that by Theorem 2.6 $\acute{G}(M) = \acute{G}_1 \cup \acute{G}_2$, where $\acute{G}_1, \acute{G}_2$ are disjoint complete subgraphs. Set $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$ and $S_i \in G_i$. Since $\acute{G}(M)$ is a r-regular graph, $|V(\acute{G}_i)| = r + 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence we have $V(\acute{G}(M)) = 2r + 2$.

□

3. Clique number, dominating number, and independence number

In this section, we obtain some results on the clique, dominating, and independence numbers of $\acute{G}(M)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let M be an R-module. Then the following hold.*

(i) *Let $\acute{G}(M)$ be a non-empty graph. Then $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) \geq |Min(M)|$.*

(ii) *Let $\acute{G}(M)$ be an empty graph. Then $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) = 1$ if and only if $Min(M) = \{S_1, S_2\}$, where S_1 and S_2 are finitely cogenerated uniform R-modules.*

(iii) *If $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) < \infty$, then $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) \geq 2^{|Min(M)|-1} - 1$.*

Proof. (i) If $|Min(M)| = 2$, then $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) \geq 2$ by Theorem 2.7. Now let $|Max(M)| \geq 3$. Then by Lemma 2.3, the subgraph of $\acute{G}(M)$ with the vertex set of $\{S_i\}_{S_i \in Min(M)}$ is a complete subgraph of $\acute{G}(M)$. So $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) \geq |Min(M)|$.

(ii) This follows directly from Theorem 2.6.

(iii) Since $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) < \infty$, we have $|Min(M)| < \infty$ by part (i), (ii). Let $Min(M) = \{S_1, ..., S_t\}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq t$, consider

$$A_i = \{S_1, ..., S_{i-1}, S_{i+1}, S_t\}.$$

Now let $P(A_i)$ be the power set of A_i and for each $X \in P(A_i)$, set $S_X = \bigcap_{S_j \in X} S_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq t$. The subgraph of $\acute{G}(M)$ with the vertex set $\{S_X\}_{X \in P(A_i) \setminus \{\emptyset\}}$ is a complete subgraph of $\acute{G}(M)$ by Lemma 2.3. It is clear that $|\{S_X\}_{X \in P(A_i) \setminus \{\emptyset\}}| = 2^{|Min(M)|-1} - 1$. Thus $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) \geq 2^{|Min(M)|-1} - 1$.

□

Remark 3.2. Note that the condition "M is a comultiplication module" is necessary in Proposition 3.1. For example, let $M = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4$ be as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module which is not a comultiplication module. Then $\omega(\acute{G}(M)) = 2$ but $|Min(M)| = 3$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be an R-module. Then $\gamma(\acute{G}(M)) \leq 2$. In particular, if $|Min(M)| < \infty$, then $\gamma(\acute{G}(M)) = 2$.*

Proof. Clearly, $|Min(M)| \geq 2$ because $\acute{G}(M)$ is a non-null graph. Consider $S = \{S_1, S_2\}$, where $S_1, S_2 \in Min(M)$. Let N be a vertex of $\acute{G}(M)$. We claim that N is adjacent to S_1 or S_2. If $S_1 \subseteq N$ or $S_2 \subseteq N$, then the claim is true. Now assume that $S_1 \nsubseteq N$ and $S_2 \nsubseteq N$. In this case, we also claim that N is adjacent to S_1 or S_2. Without loss of generality, we can assume that N is not adjacent to S_1. So $S_2 \subseteq Soc(M) \subseteq N$ by Lemma 2.2 (b). This shows that $S_2 \subseteq N$, which is a contradiction. By similar arguments, we can show that N is adjacent to S_2. Thus $\gamma(\acute{G}(M)) \leq 2$. The last assertion follows from Theorem 2.13. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let M be an R-module and $|Min(M)| < \infty$. Then $\alpha(\acute{G}(M)) = |Min(M)|$.*

Proof. Let $Min(M) = \{S_1, ..., S_n\}$. It is easy to see that $\{\Sigma_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} S_j\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is an independent set. So $\alpha(\acute{G}(M)) \geq n$. Now let $\alpha(\acute{G}(M)) = m$ and $S = \{N_1, ..., N_m\}$ be a maximal independent set. We claim that $m = n$. Assume on the contrary that $m > n$. Let $S_t \in Min(M)$. Then by Pigeon hole principal, there exist $N_i, N_j \in Min(M)$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, such that $S_t \nsubseteq N_i$ and $S_t \nsubseteq N_j$. Thus by using Lemma 2.2 (c), we have $S_t \nsubseteq N_i + N_j$. Since $N_i, N_j \in S$ and S is an independent set, we have $S_t \subseteq Soc(M) \subseteq N_i + N_j$. Then by Lemma 2.2 (c), $S_t \subseteq N_i$ or $S_t \subseteq N_j$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\alpha(\acute{G}(M)) = n$. □

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. F. Farshadifar for some helpful comments.

References

1. W. Anderson and K.R. Fuller, *Rings and categories of modules*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1974.

2. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *The dual notation of multiplication modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., (4) **11** (2007), 1189-1201.
3. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *On comultiplication modules*, Korean Ann. Math., (2) **25** (2008), 57–66.
4. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *On the dual notion of prime radicals*, Asian-Eur. J. Math., (2) **6** (2013), 1350024.
5. J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, *Graph theory*, Gradute Text in Mathematics, 244, Springer, New York, 2008.
6. T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, and P.J. Slater, *Fundemental of domination in graphs*, CRC Press, 1998.
7. S. Yassemi, *The dual notion of prime submodules*, Arch. Math., (Borno), (4) **37** (2001), 273–278.

[1]Department of Mathematics,
University of Guilan, P.O.41335-19141,
Rasht, Iran.
E-mail address: ansari@guilan.ac.ir

[2]Department of Mathematics,
University of Guilan, P.O.41335-19141,
Rasht, Iran.
E-mail address: mahboobi@phd.guilan.ac.ir